

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 were presented for examination and were rejected.

Claims 19-26 have been canceled.

Claims 1 and 27 have been amended to further clarify the invention and specify that the generated password is not identical to the selected hint. No new matter has been added.

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims and request reconsideration in light of the following comments.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claims 1-7, 10-16, and 19-33

Claims 1-7, 10-16, and 19-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over J Schneider U.S. Application Number 2004/0250138 (hereinafter "Schneider") in view of M. McCulligh, U.S. Patent 6,643,784 (hereinafter "McCulligh"). The applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A method for generating a password for a user, comprising:
presenting said user with a plurality of hints;
receiving a user selection of one of said hints;
automatically generating a password based on said selected hint,
wherein said password is not the same as said selected hint; and
presenting said selected hint to said user to reinforce said generated password.

(emphasis supplied)

Neither Schneider nor McCulligh teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what is recited in amended claim 1 — namely, the ***automatic generation of a password that is based on a hint selected by the user.***

Schneider presents an arrangement in which a user selection of images becomes a user password. Schneider does not recite the "generation of a password based on said selected hint. *In Schneider, the user selects the password, rather than the password being automatically generated.*

More precisely, Schneider discloses a method in which a user is presented with multiple images, and the user selects a subset of those images. Later, when an authentication challenge is presented to the user, the user must be able to select the same images from another plurality of images. *Thus, in Schneider, the user selection becomes the password.* (See Schneider at paragraphs [0021] and [0022])

The Office appears to concede this point, on page 3 of the pending office action, and cites McCulligh as teaching the automatic generation of passwords. In particular, the Office points to the teaching by McCulligh of “automatic password change data.” (See the pending Office Action at page 3)

However, the teaching of automatic generation of password change data is not analogous to the automatic generation of a password. Claim 1 recites the automatic generation of a password based on a selected hint. McCulligh, in contrast, teaches a system that evaluates a password, as it is entered by a user, to determine whether the password conforms to “password generation rule data.” (See McCulligh, col. 2, ll. 43-53)

The “automatic password change data” to which the Office refers is data that is generated when password rules have been met:

Also, the per character change password evaluator 18 generates acceptance password change data 44 to the notification device 22 when ***all of the rules have been met.***

(emphasis supplied)

See McCulligh, col. 4, ll. 48-51

The rules in question are password rules. In McCulligh a “password character change evaluator 18, in one embodiment, operates as a per character password data evaluator that continuously evaluates the password character data on a per character basis in view of the password generation rule data.” (See McCulligh col. 4, ll. 15-20). *Thus, a fair reading of McCulligh shows that **the “password change data” in McCulligh is not a password**; rather it is other data that is generated in the course of evaluating passwords for conformity with one or more password rules.*

Because McCulligh fails to cure the deficiencies of Schneider and teach the automatic generation of a password based on a selected hint, which is recited in claim 1, the applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 1.

Because claims 1-7 and 10-16 depend on claim 1, the rejection of them is also traversed.

Claims 19 -26 have been canceled.

Independent claim 27, as amended, recites:

27. (original) A apparatus for generating a password for a user, comprising:
a memory; and at least one processor, coupled to the memory, operative to:
present said user with a plurality of hints;
receive a user selection of one of said hints;
automatically generate a password based on said selected hint; and
present said selected hint to said user to reinforce said generated password.
(emphasis supplied)

For the same reasons as for claim 1, the applicants submit that the rejection of claim 27 is traversed.

Because claims 28-33, depend on claim 27, the applicants submit that the rejection of them is traversed.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claims 8, 9, 17, and 18

Claim 8, 9, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over J. Schneider U.S. Application Number 2005/0250138 (hereinafter "Schneider") in view of M. Serpa, U.S. Patent 6,954,862 (hereinafter "Serpa").

Because claims 8 and 9 depend on claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of them is traversed.

Claim 7 recites:

17. (original) A method for generating a password for a user, comprising:
presenting said user with a plurality of poems;
receiving a user selection of one of said poems; and
automatically generating a password based on said selected poem,
said **generated password having a similar rhyme and meter** as said selected poem.
(emphasis added)

For the same reasons as for claims 1 and 27, the applicants respectfully submit that Schneider **does not** teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, *the automatic generation of a password*.

Furthermore, nowhere Serpin, teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what is recited in claim 17 — namely, ***the receiving of a user selection of one of said poems and generating a password having a similar rhyme and meter as the selected poem.***

In the pending Office Action, the Office cited Serpa, for the proposition that Serpa discloses an arrangement in which a poem is used as a hint for the generation of a password. The applicants respectfully disagree. The Office wrote:

...Schneider is silent (if indeed is not inherent) on the capability wherein said selected hint is a poem, which could have been included in Figures 2-4 of Schneider, and said generated password has a similar rhyme and meter as said selected poem. On the other hand, Serpa teaches:

(1) The pace, **rhythm, or tempo of keystrokes becomes** as much a part of the password as the actual letters, numbers, or symbols comprising the password. An unauthorized individual might still obtain the ID and password belonging to a legitimate user but, without knowledge of the correct timing element associated with the password, the information will be useless. Because the password and the pace, rhythm, or tempo of the password **(column 4, lines 40-49 of Serpa).**

Office Action Dated 01/05/2009, page 7

Serpa, does not teach the use of a poem as a hint. Rather, Serpa teaches an arrangement in which the manner and rhythm in which an individual types the characters of a password on a keyboard or a keypad is used as a part of the password. "That is, a user not only enters the exact password/PIN into the subject device or system but does so according to certain pace, rhythm, or tempo." (**See Serpa, Summary of Invention Section, col. 2, ll. 30-33**) The teachings of Serpa do not concern the rhyme and meter of the password; *rather they concern the rhyme and meter of the keystrokes which the user has to execute in order to enter a password.*

For the foregoing reasons, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 17 is traversed.

Claim 18 recites:

18. (original) A method for generating a password for a user, comprising:

presenting said user with a plurality of jokes each containing one of a number of different variations for one or more variable words or phrases included in each joke;

receiving a user selection of one of said jokes; and

automatically generating a password based on said selected joke, said generated password including said variations for said one or more variable words or phrases.

(emphasis added)

For the same reasons as for claims 1, 17, 19, and 27 the applicants respectfully submit that Schneider **does not** teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, the automatic generation of a password.

Furthermore, nowhere Serpin, teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what is recited in claim 17 — namely, ***the receiving of a user selection of a joke and generating a password including variations of one or more variable words***. Serpin contains no reference to jokes, or variations of one ore more variable words in the jokes. Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection claim 18 is traversed.

Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the last Office action, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are remaining issues, the applicants respectfully request that Examiner telephone the applicants' attorney so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Respectfully,
Amit Bagga et al.

By **/Kiril Dimov/**
Kiril Dimov
Reg. No. 60490
732-578-0103 x215

Serial No. 10/674288

DeMont & Breyer Docket: 633-022US
Avaya Docket: 503018-A-01-US (Bagga)

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.
Suite 250
100 Commons Way
Holmdel, NJ 07733
United States of America